



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/927,899	08/10/2001	R. David L. Campbell	KANG115519	5461
26389	7590	04/19/2005		EXAMINER
CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC 1420 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 2800 SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347			LEROUX, ETIENNE PIERRE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/927,899	CAMPBELL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Etienne P LeRoux	2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 December 2004.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3, 5-16 and 19-23 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-3, 5-16 and 19-23 are is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 10 August 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

Claim Status:

Claims 1-3, 5-16 and 19-23 are pending. Claims 4, 17 and 18 have been cancelled.

Claims 1-3, 5-16 and 19-23 are rejected as detailed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 11 recites “the user being removable from the server computer when a corresponding user is removed from another server computer that issues the request.” The skilled artisan would not be able to make and use the invention because the specification does not contain a clear and concise description of what comprises a “corresponding user” and also does not include a clear and accurate description of why a corresponding user must be removed before “the user” is removable. For purposes of this office action, the above claim limitation will be interpreted to mean that an user (i.e., network administrator) can remove authorization from a user to utilize the network database.

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected for being dependent from a rejected base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 6-8, 10, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US

Pat No 5,968,176 issued to Nessett et al (hereafter Nessett).

Claims 6, 22 and 23:

Nessett discloses a method for providing remote access to the facilities of a server computer, comprising:

receiving a request [Fig 2, 111,col 10, lines 40-45] at a server computer [Fig 2, 115] operative to store and update a network database to add a new user to a group of users authorized to utilize said network database [col 15, lines 40-45];

determining whether said request may be granted [col 15, lines 40-55];

in response to determining that said request may be granted, adding said new user to said group of users authorized to utilize said network database [Fig 2 and col 16, line 55 through col 17, line 3], the said group of users defining a collaborative group spanning across the server

computer and another server computer so as to allow users to share data [groups of user identifiers, col 8, lines 27-34].

Claim 7:

Nessett discloses wherein said request is received over a secure communications link from a second server computer [col 16, lines 13-20].

Claim 8:

Nessett discloses wherein a login and password for said new user are provided as a part of said request [col 12, lines 10-21].

Claim 10:

Nessett discloses wherein said second server computer is operative to provide facilities for storing and updating said network database in a manner that is visually consistent with said Internet Web site [Fig 2 and col 15, lines 40-47].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat No 5,968,176 issued to Nessett et al (hereafter Nessett) in view of Pub No US 2002/0129058 issued to Story et al (hereafter Story).

Claim 1:

Nessett discloses a method for providing remote access to the facilities of a server computer, comprising:

receiving a user request [Fig 2, 111] to access a first server computer [Fig 2, 104];
determining whether said user request may be granted [user authentication, col 15, lines 40-55];

in response to determining that said user request may be granted, determining whether access to a second server computer [Fig 2, 108] should also be granted;

in response to determining that access to said second server computer should be granted transmitting a request to access to said second server computer from said first server computer to said second server computer via a secure communications connection [col 15, lines 55-65 and col 16, lines 13-20].

Nessett discloses the elements of the claimed invention as noted above but does not disclose said second server computer is operative to provide facilities for storing and updating said network database in a manner that is visually consistent with a Web site on the first server. Story discloses said second server computer is operative to provide facilities for storing and updating said network database in a manner that is visually consistent with a Web site on the

first server [paragraph 53, company logos are stored on a logo directory]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nessett to include disclose said second server computer is operative to provide facilities for storing and updating said network database in a manner that is visually consistent with a Web site on the first server as taught by Story for the purpose of maintaining consistency amongst company logos which are stored at a plurality of different web addresses [paragraph 53]. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Nessett per the above such that company logos are consistent and thus easily recognizable by a visitor to a particular web site.

Claim 2:

The combination of Nessett and Story discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above and furthermore, Nessett discloses wherein said second server computer comprises a server computer operative to store and update a network database [col 15, lines 55-65].

Claim 3:

The combination of Nessett and Story discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above and furthermore, Nessett discloses wherein said first server computer comprises a server computer operative to provide an Internet Web site [Fig 2, and col 15, lines 40-47]

Claim 5:

The combination of Nessett and Story discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above and furthermore, Nessett discloses receiving an indication that access to said second server computer may be granted, redirecting said user from said first computer to said second computer [col 15, lines 55-65].

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat No 5,968,176 issued to Nessett et al (hereafter Nessett) in view of US Pat No 6,539,021 issued to Kennelly et al (hereafter Kennelly).

Claim 9:

Nessett discloses the elements of claims 6-8 as noted above but does not disclose determining whether said new user has been previously been added to said group of users authorized to utilize said network database and in response to determining that said user has previously been added to said group of authorized users, denying said request to add said new user. Kennelly discloses determining whether said new user has been previously been added to said group of users authorized to utilize said network database and in response to determining that said user has previously been added to said group of authorized users, denying said request to add said new user [Fig 8, col 10, line 65 - col 11, line 5]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nessett to include determining whether said new user has been previously been added to said group of users authorized to utilize said network database and in response to determining that said user has previously been added to said group of authorized users, denying said request to add said new user as taught by Kennelly for the purpose of preventing duplicate log-in entries for the user. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Nessett per the above such that the access control list for the user group would not be confused by duplicate entries for the users registered in the group.

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nessett in view of US Pat No 6,339,826 issued to Hayes et al (hereafter Hayes).

Claim 11:

Nessett discloses a method for providing remote access to the facilities of a server computer, comprising:

receiving a request at a server computer operative to store and update a network database to update user data for a user authorized to utilize said network database; determining whether said request may be granted; and in response to determining that said request may be granted, updating said user data as specified in said request [Fig 2 and col 16, line 55 – col 17, line 3].

Nessett discloses the elements of the claimed invention as noted above but does not disclose the user being removable from the server computer when a corresponding user is removed from another server computer that issues the request. Hayes discloses the user being removable from the server computer when a corresponding user is removed from another server computer that issues the request [col 21, lines 15-32, Fig 22]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nessett to include the user being removable from the server computer when a corresponding user is removed from another server computer that issues the request as taught by Hayes for the purpose of adding/deleting users from the group. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Nessett per the such that the dynamic situation in the business world can be accommodated wherein employees are constantly being assigned to and removed from groups.

Claim 12:

The combination of Nessett and Hayes discloses the elements of claim 11 as noted above and furthermore, Nessett discloses wherein said request is received over a secure communications link from a second server computer [col 16, lines 13-20].

Claim 13:

The combination of Nessett and Hayes discloses the elements of claim 11 as noted above and furthermore, Nessett discloses wherein said first server computer comprises a server computer operative to provide an Internet Web site [Fig 2, and col 15, lines 40-47]

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nessett in view of US Pat No 5,946,686 issued to Schmuck et al (hereafter Schmuck).

Claim 14:

Nessett discloses:

receiving a request [Fig 2, 111] for a facility available at a server computer operative to store and update a network database via a secure communications link [Fig 2];

determining whether said request may be granted [col 15, lines 55-65];

in response to determining that said request may be granted, executing said facility at said server computer according to said request [Fig 2, col 15, lines 55-65 and col 16, lines 13-20].

Nesbett discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention as noted above but does not disclose said facility including creation of a new collaborative group in which users may share data, the method refraining from creating said collaborative group if a quota has been exceeded. Schmuck discloses said facility including creation of a new collaborative group in which users may share data [col 4, lines 63-67]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nesbett to include said facility including creation of a new collaborative group in which users may share data as taught by Schmuck for the purpose of regulating a user/ user group according to the amount of disk space that is available [col 4, lines 63-67]. The skilled technician would have been motivated to modify Nesbett per the above such that a shared disk file system running on multiple computers can be coupled for parallel data sharing access to files residing on network shared disks [abstract].

Claims 15, 16 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Nesbett and Schmuck and further in view of Hayes.

Claims 15 and 21:

The combination of Nesbett and Schmuck discloses the elements of claim 14 as noted above but does not disclose the user being removable from the server computer when a corresponding user is removed from another server computer that issues the request. Hayes discloses the user being removable from the server computer when a corresponding user is removed from another server computer that issues the request [col 21, lines 15-32, Fig 22]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

Art Unit: 2161

modify the combination of Nessett and Schmuck to include the user being removable from the server computer when a corresponding user is removed from another server computer that issues the request as taught by Hayes for the purpose of adding/deleting users from the group. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the combination of Nessett and Schmuck per the above such that the dynamic situation in the business world can be accommodated wherein employees are constantly being assigned to and removed from groups.

Claim 16:

The combination of Nessett, Schmuck and Hayes discloses the elements of claims 14 and 15 as noted above and furthermore, Nessett discloses wherein aid request further comprises a user ID for said user to be deleted [col 12, lines 10-21]

Claim 19:

The combination of Nessett, Schmuck and Hayes discloses the elements of claim 14 as noted above and furthermore, Nessett discloses wherein said request further comprises the identity of one or more users to be added to said new collaborative group [col 16, line 55-col 17, line 3].

Claim 20:

The combination of Nessett, Schmuck and Hayes discloses the elements of claim 14 as noted above and furthermore, Nessett discloses wherein said facility comprises an application programming interface for adding new users to an existing collaborative group in which users may share data [col 16, line 55-col 17, line 3].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments files 12/17/2004 with respect to claims 1-3, 5-16 and 19-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the above new ground(s) of rejection based on Applicant's most recent claim amendments.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Etienne LeRoux whose telephone number is (571) 272-4022. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Etienne LeRoux whose telephone number is (571) 272-4022. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (571) 272-4023.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

Patent related correspondence can be forwarded via the following FAX number (571) 272-2100.

Etienne LeRoux

4/12/2005

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (571) 272-4023.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

Patent related correspondence can be forwarded via the following FAX number (571) 272-2100.

Etienne LeRoux

4/12/2005



SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100